



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Christopher William Dunsmore: Professional conduct panel outcome

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the
Secretary of State for Education**

January 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher: Mr Christopher William Dunsmore

Teacher ref number: 0115539

Teacher date of birth: 23 August 1980

TRA reference: 16751

Date of determination: 31 January 2022

Former employer: Colfe's School, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened virtually on 31 January 2022, to consider the case of Mr Christopher William Dunsmore.

The panel members were Mr Steve Woodhouse (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Martin Coles (teacher panellist) and Ms Asma Majid (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Fallon Alexis of QEB Hollis Whiteman instructed by FieldFisher LLP solicitors.

Mr Dunsmore was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 11 November 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Dunsmore was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 9 November 2020, he was convicted of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child on 21 August 2017, contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s15A(1)

In his response to the notice of hearing, Mr Dunsmore has admitted both the fact of the allegation and that it constitutes a conviction of a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

Applicable Procedures

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new Teacher Misconduct Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession were published in May 2020 (the “May 2020 Procedures”). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the Teacher misconduct disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession updated in April 2018 (the “April 2018 Procedures”) apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the April 2018 Procedures in this case.

Proceeding in Absence

The panel has considered whether this hearing should continue in the absence of the teacher.

The panel is satisfied that TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers’ Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the “Regulations”).

The panel is also satisfied that the notice of proceedings complied with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession, (the “Procedures”).

The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel has taken as its starting point the principle from *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel has recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

In making its decision, the panel has noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel has firstly taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones*.

On 17 November 2021, Mr Dunsmore signed an acknowledgement to confirm that he had received the notice of proceedings. Furthermore, he has provided his response to the notice of proceedings confirming that he did not intend to be present at the hearing, nor did he intend to be represented. The panel therefore considers that the teacher has waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place.

In the circumstances, the panel did not consider that there was any likelihood that an adjournment would result in Mr Dunsmore attending the hearing.

The panel notes that Mr Dunsmore has admitted the fact of the allegation and also that it constitutes conviction of a relevant offence. In a conviction case such as this, the hearing will not re-examine the facts of the case and the panel is obliged to accept the conviction as conclusive proof that establishes the relevant facts. The extent of the disadvantage to the teacher, is therefore less than in a case where the allegations are disputed, and where there is no conviction.

Mr Dunsmore has given no indication as to his reason for not attending the hearing, and there is no suggestion that, if the hearing was to be adjourned, that the position may change.

The panel has recognised that the allegations against the teacher are serious and that there is a real risk that if proven, the panel will be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching.

The panel recognises that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers is required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. The conduct alleged is said to have taken place whilst the teacher was employed by a school. The school will have an interest in this hearing taking place in order to draw a line under this matter.

The panel notes that there are no witnesses to be called, and therefore the effect of delay on the memories of witnesses is not a factor to be taken into consideration in this case.

The panel has decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher. Mr Dunsmore has plainly waived his right to appear; and an adjournment is unlikely to result in him attending. On balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing today.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list and List of Key People – pages 1 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 4 to 25

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 84

Section 4: Presenting officer correspondence with teacher and delivery receipts – pages 85 to 107

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

The panel was advised by the presenting officer that there were a number of further redactions that ought to have been made to the bundle. The panel was asked to proceed as if the following matters were redacted page 98, item 14; page 55, the sentence following the heading "Other Information" and page 30, the date of suspension and dismissal. The panel confirmed it would treat these matters as redacted and, on the advice of the legal adviser, confirmed the panel would put them out of their minds.

After announcing its findings of fact, the panel received a second bundle containing the same documents as stated above, but with some redactions removed.

Witnesses

The panel heard no oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

On 30 August 2007, Mr Dunsmore commenced employment as a teacher at Colfe's School. On 5 September 2017, Mr Dunsmore was arrested by the Metropolitan Police. On 9 November 2020, Mr Dunsmore appeared before Woolwich Crown Court and pleaded guilty to the offence with which he had been charged.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation against you proved, for these reasons:

On 9 November 2020, you were convicted of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child on 21 August 2017, contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s 15A(1).

The panel has seen a certificate of conviction dated 15 March 2020 confirming that Mr Dunsmore was convicted at the Crown Court at Woolwich on 9 November 2020, of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child. It states that he was sentenced to 6 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months and to appear on the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years. It also states that he is subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order until further order under s103 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. The police national computer record print confirms that the charge was "Attempt/Engage in sexual communication with a child on 21/08/17 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s 15A(1). It also confirms that Mr Dunsmore received a sentence of "suspended imprisonment 6 mths consecutive, wholly suspended 24 mths s20200270 programme requirement 30 days consecutive rehabilitation activity requirement 35 days consecutive victim surcharge 115.00".

The panel therefore finds this allegation proven, and accepts the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof that establishes the relevant facts leading to the conviction.

The panel has not seen the transcripts of Mr Dunsmore's interviews with the police. From the police Case File Summary, it is apparent that Mr Dunsmore responded to someone posing as, and who introduced herself as, a 14 year old female in a chat room, and that Mr Dunsmore had introduced himself by his first name, stating he was 36 years old and a teacher. A sexualised conversation ensued which culminated in Mr Dunsmore masturbating and ejaculating for the operative to see.

It is recorded that Mr Dunsmore was interviewed on two separate occasions on 15 September 2017 and 16 November 2018 and gave no comment answers.

Mr Dunsmore then requested a further interview after a third party had been invited to the police station for an interview under caution. He explained that it had never been his intention to create any suspicion over that third party. The police Case File Summary contains a summary of Mr Dunsmore's responses during this interview. He stated that he would try and speak with girls between 13 – 15 years old, and that he wouldn't speak with anyone pre-pubescent, and he was not interested in talking to older girls as people in their 20s are unwilling to chat. He referred to having a long term habit/addiction to

online chat rooms, that had started when he was 21 and training to be a teacher. He said that initially he would speak to people that were 16 – 19 years old, as he hadn't had many serious girlfriends, and preferred younger girls as he wasn't very confident. He said that he found it exciting and it became a habit. He referred to having given up the online chatrooms for months at a time, but that he had done it more over the last few years. He stated that it was very early on that he had started to talk to children, that the chat rooms were for 13-19 years olds and he was aware of this when entering them. He stated that he engaged in sexual conversations with 13 – 15 year olds for sexual gratification, and suspected that this would be illegal.

He confirmed that images captured were of himself, and that one image showed him masturbating on webcam, being aware that it was a child he was speaking to at the time. He stated that if he upset a child, he would change his username. With regard to information Mr Dunsmore would give about himself, he said that he would quite often give his age and say that he was a teacher so that there was a real element to the conversation. He was asked if this was to gain their trust and he said that it wasn't. He stated that he would often offer to do their homework, but never actually did. He said this was because he liked to give something in return and liked the idea of the child being in control. He said that he had been doing this since he was 21, roughly once a week, that he would do it at home, that he had never met up with anyone he had chatted to, and that he was not sexually attracted to children. He said that the nature of what he was doing made him excited and he liked the idea of breaking the rules.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Dunsmore, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Dunsmore was in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The conviction confirms that Mr Dunsmore has deliberately sought out an underage child with whom to engage in inappropriate sexualised conversations for his own sexual gratification. The sentencing remarks made reference to Mr Dunsmore having accepted that he had engaged in conversations with young females below the age of 16, for a long time, since the age of 21. This causes concerns about the safeguarding of children in his care.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence failed to have regard to the potential abuse he would cause to an individual who he thought to be underage, and to those, who on his own admission, he had spoken to who were in fact underage.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Dunsmore's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Dunsmore's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel took into account steps taken by Mr Dunsmore to try and address his offending behaviour that were recognised by the court in sentencing him. This included [redacted]. The panel also noted that Mr Dunsmore had been employed by Colfe's school for 10 years, although no evidence is provided as to his teaching proficiency.

Although the panel found that the steps taken by Mr Dunsmore to address his behaviour were of note, albeit no evidence had been provided as to its efficacy, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Dunsmore's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and

proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found all of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the protection of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Dunsmore, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given his conviction for "attempt/engage in sexual communication with a child". Indeed, Mr Dunsmore has received an indefinite sexual harm prevention order to "protect the public or any particular member of the public in the United Kingdom from sexual harm, or protect children or vulnerable adults generally, or any particular children or vulnerable adults outside the United Kingdom from sexual harm".

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Dunsmore were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Dunsmore was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Dunsmore in the profession, as although he may have had some ability as an educator (and nothing is known of that), his behaviour fundamentally breaches the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Dunsmore.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Dunsmore. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;

sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was evidence that Mr Dunsmore's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Dunsmore was acting under duress, and, in fact, the panel found Mr Dunsmore's actions to be calculated and motivated by his own sexual gratification.

The panel accepted that Mr Dunsmore did not have any previous disciplinary orders against him. However, it is apparent that he has accepted that he had been engaging in conversations with young females for a long time, since the age of 21, and that some of those young females were below the age of 16.

No testimonial statements have been provided by Mr Dunsmore attesting to his good character or ability as a teacher.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Dunsmore of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Dunsmore. Mr Dunsmore's disregard for the impact on those with whom he engaged in sexual conversation was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the

panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Mr Dunsmore was responsible for engaging in sexual communications with a child. It is apparent that Mr Dunsmore would refer to his position as teacher during such conversations, and offer to do the child's homework. This constituted an abuse of his professional position in order to achieve his own sexual gratification.

Mr Dunsmore pleaded guilty at the Crown Court. It is apparent that having initially given two no comment interviews, he requested a third interview in which he appears to have co-operated fully with the questions asked, and made numerous admissions during that interview as to his conduct. His co-operation appears to have been prompted by the police's interview of a third party, and not wanting suspicion to fall upon that third party. The Crown Court recognised steps Mr Dunsmore had taken and it was recognised that he had some insight into the nature of his behaviour and the damage that his behaviour can do to young girls. The panel has, however, seen no direct evidence itself that could satisfy it that since his sentencing, Mr Dunsmore has continued his path to address his behaviour. Furthermore, after announcing its findings of fact, and prior to considering whether to recommend whether a prohibition order should be imposed, the panel was made aware of a further conviction. Following Mr Dunsmore's third interview in which he admitted having committed the offence of 21 August 2017 and prior to his conviction and sentencing for that offence, he subsequently went on to commit a similar further offence in 2019 for which he was also convicted and sentenced on 9 November 2020. It was apparent to the panel that even an ongoing police investigation had not dissuaded Mr Dunsmore from his offending behaviour, and indicates a real risk of repetition.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Christopher Dunsmore should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Dunsmore is in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

"The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession."

The finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence is particularly serious, the panel noted that "The conviction confirms that Mr Dunsmore has deliberately sought out an underage child with whom to engage in inappropriate sexualised conversations for his own sexual gratification."

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider

whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Dunsmore, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “The sentencing remarks made reference to Mr Dunsmore having accepted that he had engaged in conversations with young females below the age of 16, for a long time, since the age of 21. This causes concerns about the safeguarding of children in his care.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The Crown Court recognised steps Mr Dunsmore had taken and it was recognised that he had some insight into the nature of his behaviour and the damage that his behaviour can do to young girls. The panel has, however, seen no direct evidence itself that could satisfy it that since his sentencing, Mr Dunsmore has continued his path to address his behaviour. Furthermore, after announcing its findings of fact, and prior to considering whether to recommend whether a prohibition order should be imposed, the panel was made aware of a further conviction. Following Mr Dunsmore’s third interview in which he admitted having committed the offence of 21 August 2017 and prior to his conviction and sentencing for that offence, he subsequently went on to commit a similar further offence in 2019 for which he was also convicted and sentenced on 9 November 2020. It was apparent to the panel that even an ongoing police investigation had not dissuaded Mr Dunsmore from his offending behaviour, and indicates a real risk of repetition.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight and further conviction means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel was of the view that “prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Dunsmore. Mr Dunsmore’s disregard for the impact on those with whom he engaged in sexual conversation was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant conviction in relation to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s15A(1) and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Dunsmore himself. A prohibition order would prevent him from teaching and would also deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Dunsmore would refer to his position as a teacher and offer to do the child's homework, during chat room conversations. The panel observed "This constituted an abuse of his professional position in order to achieve his own sexual gratification."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Dunsmore has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered whether a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, two factors mean that a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the panel's comments in relation to the risk of repetition and the serious sexual nature of the conviction.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Christopher Dunsmore is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Dunsmore shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Dunsmore has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 04 February 2022

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.